APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,670	02/11/2002	Erik B. Christensen	50037.94USU1/167394.2	4585

27488	7590	08/04/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/073,670	CHRISTENSEN ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Laurie Ries	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 22 May 2006, to the original application filed 11 February 2002.

2.   Claims 1-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Microsoft Corporation, "Draft: Discovery of Web Services (DISCO)" (hereafter referred to as "The DISCO Document").

3.   Claims 20-22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Corporation, "Draft: Discovery of Web Services (DISCO)" (hereafter referred to as "The DISCO Document") and Newell (U.S. Publication 2003/0112270 A1).

4.   The rejection of claims 1, 10-14, 16-17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (U.S. Patent 6,631,496 B1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

5.   The rejection of claims 2-9, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (U.S. Patent 6,631,496 B1) in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,651,059 B1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

6.   The rejection of claims 15, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Li (U.S. Patent 6,631,496 B1) in view of Manning (U.S. Publication

2002/0103829 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly

found prior art.

7.   Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 17, and 20 are independent claims.

Response to Arguments

8.   The declarations filed on 22 May 2006 under 37 CFR 1.132 have been

considered but are ineffective to overcome the reference by Microsoft Corporation,

"Draft: Discovery of Web Services (DISCO)", hereafter referred to as the DISCO

document.

The declaration filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 attempts to show that the DISCO

document was authored by the inventors of the present application (U.S. Patent

Application Serial No. 10/073670). Applicant has provided two declarations under

Appendices A and B of the Instant Amendment, a first declaration, Appendix A, signed

by Erik Christensen and Andrew Layman, co-inventors of the present application (U.S.

Patent Application Serial No. 10/073670), and a second declaration, Appendix B,

signed by Henrik Frystyk Nielsen, the third co-inventor of the present application (U.S.

Patent Application Serial No. 10/073670), and updated from the previously submitted

declaration by Mr. Nielsen, as filed 31 October 2005 and 2 December 2005.

Additionally, Applicant has provided in Appendix D of the Instant Amendment the

Applicant's last version of the DISCO document dated 7 July 2000. Applicant has also

provided in Appendix C of the Instant Amendment an email thread dated 7 July 2000

presenting a communication between Erik Christensen, one of the co-inventors of the

present application, and Sara Williams, a technical writer who prepares documents for

publication on the Microsoft developer network.

As stated in the previous Office Action filed 21 February 2006, the submission of

the **final** version of the DISCO document does not provide the background necessary to

show that the **original** DISCO document was authored by the inventors. The email

thread provided in Appendix C implies that co-inventor Erik Christensen was involved in

revisions to the final DISCO document, however it does not show **authorship of the**

original DISCO document.

The Office notes the correction to item #5 of the Nielson declaration, previously

stating that the technical content was provided to the author of the DISCO document by

the inventors, as filed 31 October 2005 and 2 December 2005, and corrected to state

that the final version of the DISCO document was authored by the inventors, as filed 22

May 2006. The Office respectfully requests clarification as to why a single declaration

signed by all three inventors was not submitted, as opposed to two separate

declarations, the first signed by two inventors and the second signed by the third

inventor. (See MPEP 715.01(c))

To further clarification the record, the Office respectfully suggests the submission

of a declaration by the technical writer, identified in Appendix C as Sara Williams,

stating that the DISCO document contains information provided solely by the inventors

and that no additional input to the DISCO document was added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9.   Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

Microsoft Corporation, "Draft: Discovery of Web Services (DISCO)" (hereafter referred

to as "The DISCO Document").

As per claim 1, The DISCO Document discloses a computer-implemented

method for identifying metadata about a resource in the form of a Discovery Document

which is identified by a first identifier, including issuing a request to get a rendition of the

resource identified by the first identifier (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1,

Bullet 2 – sample algorithm), parsing a response document received in response to the

issued request (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 3 – the sample

algorithm shows that the response document is parsed to determine the existence of a

LINK tag within the content), and, if the response document includes an indication that

the metadata exists within a resource identified by a second identifier, retrieving the

metadata from the other resource identified by the second identifier, the indication

identifying the metadata format (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 2

– sample algorithm, line following "Then:"). The DISCO Document also discloses

generating a request to retrieve the metadata from the second resource, where the

generated request is formatted to support the metadata format identified by the

indication (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1)

As per claim 2, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the response document

includes an XML document and the indication includes an XML processing instruction

(See The DISCO Document, Page 3, Section 2, paragraphs 5-7).

As per claim 3, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 2 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the identifier includes a

Universal Resource Identifier (See The DISCO Document, Page 3, Section 3,

Paragraph 1).

As per claim 4, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 2 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the indication also includes

an attribute identifying an "alternate" relation (See The DISCO Document, Page 2,

Section 1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm, "rel='alternate'").

As per claim 5, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 2 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the indication also includes

the second identifier (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 3 – sample

algorithm, "href='U2'").

As per claim 6, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the response document

includes an HTML document and the indication includes a LINK tag (See The DISCO

Document, Page 2, Section1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm).

As per claim 7, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 6 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the LINK tag also includes

an attribute identifying an expected response type of text/xml (See The DISCO

Document, Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm).

As per claim 8, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 6 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the LINK tag also includes

an attribute identifying an "alternate" relation (See The DISCO Document, Page 2,

Section 1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm).

As per claim 9, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 6 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the LINK tag also includes

the second identifier (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 3 – sample

algorithm, "href='U2'").

As per claim 10, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that retrieving the metadata

from the other location occurs automatically and without further user interaction (See

The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 2 – sample algorithm).

As per claim 11, The DISCO Document discloses a computer-readable medium

encoded with a data structure including a discovery document including metadata about

a resource stored at a first location identified by a first identifier, the discovery document

being stored at a second location identified by a second identifier, where the metadata

is retrieved from the second location in response to a request, and also where the

request is formatted to support the metadata format identified by the typed link (See The

DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Paragraphs 1-2), the discovery document also

including at least one typed link indicating the existence of further metadata about the

resource (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm),

where the typed link identified the metadata format (See The DISCO Document, Pages

1-2, Section 1).

As per claim 12, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 11 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the typed link indicates the

existence of a second discovery document and a location of the second discovery

document (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm).

As per claim 13, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 11 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the typed link indicates a

link to a Web-based service (See The DISCO Document, Page 4, Section 3, Paragraph

1 and example, line 3).

As per claim 14, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 13 as described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that another typed link indicates a link to a description of the Web-based service (See The DISCO Document, Page 4, Section 3, Paragraph 1 and example, line 3).

As per claim 15, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 11 as described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the typed link indicates a link to an XML schema (See The DISCO Document, Page 4, Section 3).

As per claim 16, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 11 as described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the identifier includes a Universal Resource Identifier (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Paragraph 2).

As per claim 17, The DISCO Document discloses a computer-readable medium with a data structure including a response document issued in response to a request for a resource, the response document including an indication that a document exists including metadata about the resource at a second location that is different from the first location (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Paragraph 1, and Pages 2-3, Section 2). The DISCO document also discloses issuing a request to retrieve the metadata from the second resource (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1).

As per claim 18, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 17 as described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the response document is an HTML document and the indication includes a LINK tag (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm).

As per claim 19, The DISCO Document discloses the limitations of claim 18 as

described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the response document is

an XML document and the indication includes an XML stylesheet processing instruction

(See The DISCO Document, Page 3, Section 2, Paragraphs 5 and 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Microsoft Corporation, "Draft: Discovery of Web Services (DISCO)" (hereafter referred

to as "The DISCO Document") in view of Newell (U.S. Publication 2003/0112270 A1).

As per claim 20, The DISCO Document discloses a system for communicating

data over a network including a client computer configured to issue a request for a

resource and to receive information in response to the request (See The DISCO

Document, Page 2, Section 1, Paragraph 2), a response document based on the

resource including an indication of the existence of a discovery document at a location

different than the server computer, the discovery document including metadata about

the resource (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1, Paragraph 1, and Pages

2-3, Section 2), and where the client computer receives the response document

including the indication of the discovery document (See The DISCO Document, Page 2,

Section 1, Paragraph 2). The DISCO Document also discloses that the indication

identifies the metadata format (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section 1). The

DISCO Document also discloses that the client computer generates a request to

retrieve the metadata from the discovery document where the generated request is

formatted to support the metadata format (See The DISCO Document, Page 2, Section

1). The DISCO Document does not disclose expressly the inclusion of a server

computer including a resource. Newell discloses a server computer that contains a

number of secondary pages that include discovery information (See Newell, Page 2,

Paragraphs 0029-0030). The DISCO Document and Newell are analogous art because

they are from the same field of endeavor of accessing discovery information. At the

time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

include the server containing resources of Newell with the system of The DISCO

Document. The motivation for doing so would have been to store the resource

information so that it is accessible to client computers via a network (See Newell, page

2, Paragraph 0029 and Page 3, Paragraph 0042). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Newell with The DISCO Document for the benefit of storing the

resource information so that it is accessible to client computers via a network to obtain

the invention as specified in claim 20.

   As per claim 21, The DISCO Document and Newell disclose the limitations of

claim 20 as described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the response

document includes an XML document and the indication of the existence of the

discovery document includes an XML stylesheet processing instruction (See The

DISCO Document, Page 3, Section 2, Paragraphs 5-7).

As per claim 22, The DISCO Document and Newell disclose the limitations of

claim 20 as described above. The DISCO Document also discloses that the response

document includes an HTML document and the indication of the existence of the

discovery document includes a LINK tag (See The DISCO Document, Page 3, Section

2, Paragraph 2, and Page 2, Section 1, Bullet 3 – sample algorithm).

11.   Claims 1, 10-14, 16-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Li (U.S. Patent 6,631,496 B1) in view of Kusama (U.S. patent 6,

571,248 B1).

As per independent claim 1, Li discloses a computer-implemented method for

identifying metadata about a resource identified by a first identifier (See Li, Column 5,

lines 34-53) including issuing a request to get a rendition of the resource identified by

the first identifier, such as a URL (See Li, Column 5, lines 48-53). Li also discloses

parsing a response document received in response to the issued request (See Li,

Column 8, lines 16-20). While Li does not disclose expressly retrieving metadata from

the other resources identified by a second identifier, Li does disclose that the

documents discovered in response to the request are matched to the original resource

by searching for particular values in the discovered documents, such as keywords or

links (See Li, Column 7, lines 14-53, and Figure 9). At the time of the invention it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the metadata, such

as certain keywords, included in the request are retrieved from the discovered

documents. The motivation for such a conclusion would have been to allow a user to

locate keywords within the discovered documents thus indicating a relationship between

the original resource and the discovered documents and providing a method to

bookmark said discovered documents (See Li, Column 6, lines 43-60).

Li also does not disclose expressly an indication identifying the metadata format,

or the generation of a request to retrieve the metadata from the second resource where

the generated request is formatted to support the metadata format. Kusama discloses

indicating a metadata format, such as a binary format (See Kusama, Column 11, lines

66-67, and Column 12, lines 1-13). Kusama also discloses generating a request to

retrieve the metadata from a second resource supporting the metadata format (See

Kusama, Column 12,lines 30-35).

Li and Kusama are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor of processing metadata.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to include the metadata format and request to retrieve the metadata in the metadata

format of Kusama with the metadata processing system and method of Li. The

motivation for doing so would have been to synthesize the metadata in a particular

order, such as by date, in order to describe the relationship between documents (See

Kusama, Column 2, lines 33-39, Column 11, lines 61-67, and Column 12, lines 1-4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kusama with Li for the benefit of

synthesizing the metadata in a particular order, such as by date, in order to describe the relationship between documents to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per dependent claim 10, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Li also discloses that retrieving of metadata from another location occurs automatically and without further user interaction (See Li, Column 2, lines 36-39).

As per independent claims 11, 17, and 20, Li and Kusama disclose a computer readable medium including a discovery document, or resource, stored in the data structure including metadata about a resource stored at a first location identified by a first identifier, and at least one typed link (See Li, Column 4, lines 35-48, Figure 9, and Column 7, lines 14-53). Li also discloses a data structure stored at a second location identified by a second identifier, such as the Internet (See Li, Column 5, lines 15-19, and lines 48-53). While Li does not disclose expressly that the one typed link indicates the existence of metadata from the other resources identified by a second identifier, Li does disclose that the documents discovered in response to the request are matched to the original resource by searching for particular values in the discovered documents, such as keywords or links (See Li, Column 7, lines 14-53, and Figure 9). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the metadata, such as certain keywords, included in the request exist in the discovered documents. The motivation for such a conclusion would have been to allow a user to locate keywords within the discovered documents thus indicating a

relationship between the original resource and the discovered documents and providing a method to bookmark said discovered documents (See Li, Column 6, lines 43-60).

Li also does not disclose expressly an indication identifying the metadata format, or the generation of a request to retrieve the metadata from the second resource where the generated request is formatted to support the metadata format. Kusama discloses indicating a metadata format, such as a binary format (See Kusama, Column 11, lines 66-67, and Column 12, lines 1-13). Kusama also discloses generating a request to retrieve the metadata from a second resource supporting the metadata format (See Kusama, Column 12,lines 30-35). Kusama also discloses that the second document is at a location different from the server computer (See Kusama, Column 12, lines 30-33).

Li and Kusama are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing metadata.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the metadata format and request to retrieve the metadata in the metadata format of Kusama with the metadata processing system and method of Li. The motivation for doing so would have been to synthesize the metadata in a particular order, such as by date, in order to describe the relationship between documents (See Kusama, Column 2, lines 33-39, Column 11, lines 61-67, and Column 12, lines 1-4). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Kusama with Li for the benefit of synthesizing the metadata in a particular order, such as by date, in order to describe the relationship between documents to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11, 17, and 20.

As per dependent claim 12, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of claim 11

as described above. Li also discloses that the typed link indicates the existence of a -

second discovery document and a location of the second discovery document (See Li,

Figure 9, and Column 7, lines 14-53).

As per dependent claim 13, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of claim 11

as described above. Li also discloses that the typed link indicates a link to a Web-

based service (See Li, Column 5, lines 15-19).

As per dependent claim 14, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of claim 13

as described above. Li also discloses that another typed link indicates a link to a

description of the Web-based service (See Li, Column 5, lines 23-33).

As per dependent claim 16, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of claim 11

as described above. Li also discloses that the identifier includes a URL (See Li, Column

8, lines 32-60).

12.   Claims 2-9, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Li (U.S. Patent 6,631,496 B1) in view of Kusama (U.S. Patent

6,571,248 B1) as applied to claims 1, 17, and 20 above, and further in view of

Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,651,059 B1).

As per dependent claim 2, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. Li and Kusama do not disclose expressly that the response document

includes an XML document and the indication includes an XML processing instruction.

Sundaresan discloses XML documents discovered by mining relevant terms included in metadata of a resource document (See Sundaresan, Column 6, lines 59-67, and Column 7, lines 1-20). Li, Kusama, and Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of discovering related documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the XML documents and processing instructions of Sundaresan with the method for identifying metadata about a resource of Li and Kusama. The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize the framework provided by XML, a meta-language that is used to specify a set of rules for use on the World Wide Web (See Sundaresan, Column 5, lines 36-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Li and Kusama for the benefit of utilizing the framework provided by XML, a meta-language that is used to specify a set of rules for use on the World Wide Web to discover documents related to a resource and thus to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

As per dependent claim 3, Li, Kusama, and Sundaresan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Li also discloses that the first identifier and the second identifier include a URL (See Li, Column 8, lines 32-60).

As per dependent claim 4, Li, Kusama, and Sundaresan disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Li also discloses that the indication also includes an attribute identifying an "alternate" relation (See Li, Column 7, lines 31-37, Column 13, lines 64-67, and Column 14, lines 1-7).

As per dependent claim 5, Li, Kusama, and Sundaresan disclose the limitations
of claim 2 as described above. Li also discloses that the indication also includes the
second identifier (See Li, Figure 7B, and Column 5, lines 34-53).

As per dependent claims 6, 7, 18, and 22, Li and Kusama disclose the
limitations of claims 1, 17, and 20 as described above. Li also discloses that the
response document includes an HTML document (See Li, Column 13,lines 12-17) Li
does not disclose expressly that the indication includes a LINK tag. Sundaresan
discloses that hyperlink metadata is identified in the discovered documents (See
Sundaresan, Column 6, lines 59-67, and Column 7, lines 1-20). It is well known that
hypertext link data is included in a link tag, which include various MIME types, such as
text/html or text/xml. Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the same
field of endeavor of discovering related documents. At the time of the invention it would
have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the link data of
Sundaresan with the method for identifying metadata about a resource of Li and
Kusama. The motivation for doing so would have been to process the documents
discovered through the association rules related to the hypertext links in the discovered
documents and thereby process or mine additional related documents (See
Sundaresan, Column 7, lines 62-67, and Column 8, lines 1-24). Therefore, it would
have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Li and Kusama for the benefit of
processing the documents discovered through the association rules related to the
hypertext links in the discovered documents and thereby processing or mining

additional related documents to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6, 7, 18, and

22.

As per dependent claim 8, Li, Kusama, and Sundaresan disclose the limitations

of claim 6 as described above. Li also discloses including an attribute identifying an

"alternate" relation (See Li, Column 7, lines 31-37, Column 13, lines 64-67, and Column

14, lines 1-7).

As per dependent claim 9, Li, Kusama, and Sundaresan disclose the limitations

of claim 6 as described above. Li also discloses including a second identifier (See Li,

Figure 7B, and Column 5, lines 34-53).

13.   Claims 15, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Li (U.S. Patent 6,631,496 B1) in view of Kusama (U.S. Patent

6,571,248 B1) as applied to claims 11, 17, and 20 above, and further in view of Manning

(U.S. Publication 2002/0103829 A1).

As per dependent claim 15, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of claim 11

as described above. Li and Kusama do not disclose expressly that the typed link

indicates a link to an XML schema. Manning discloses a XML schema that defines an

XML document (See Manning, Page 1, paragraph 0012, and Page 4, paragraph 0041).

Li, Kusama, and Manning are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor of managing markup language data. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to link the metadata of a resource of Li

and Kusama to an XML schema of Manning. The motivation for doing so would have

been to determine the element/attribute schema of the resource document (See

Manning, Page 4, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Manning with Li and Kusama for the benefit of determining the element/attribute

schema of the resource document to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

·**As per dependent claims 19 and 21**, Li and Kusama disclose the limitations of

claims 17 and 20 as described above. Li and Kusama do not disclose expressly that

the response document is an XML document and that the indication includes an XML

stylesheet processing instruction. Manning discloses XML documents including

stylesheet processing (See Manning, Page 5, paragraph 0045). Li, Kusama, and

Manning are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

managing markup language data. At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the XML document and stylesheet

processing of Manning with the discovered documents of Li and Kusama. The

motivation for doing so would have been to discover XML documents and to process

the stylesheet, which, as is known in the art, defines the layout of the XML data on a

display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Manning with Li and

Kusama for the benefit of discovering XML type documents and processing the

stylesheet to define the layout of the XML data on a display to obtain the invention as

specified in claims 19 and 21.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Kadel Jr. (U.S. Publication 2002/0184401 A1) discloses an extensible
  information system.

- Berkun (U.S. Publication 2002/0103920 A1) discloses an interpretive
  stream metadata extraction.

15.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

17.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER